

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-7 and 17-23 were pending in the application. Claims 1-7 and 17-23 were rejected. Claims 8-16 and 24-32 were withdrawn. No claims were merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By the entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 6 and 22 are cancelled without prejudice or devotion of the subject matter to the public, claims 1, 7, 17 and 23 are amended, and no new claims are added. Support for the amendments to the claims may at least be found in paragraph [0012] of Applicants' Specification as filed, including the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. No new matter is presented.

Claim Rejections Under §35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner asserts claims 1-6 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the book entitled "Complete Idiots' Guide to Product Management", by Baker et al. ("Baker"). Applicants traverse the rejection.

The Examiner relies upon pages 89-101 and 361-375 of the Baker reference to allegedly anticipate each and every element of Applicants claims.

Applicants' claims 2-6 and 16-22 are ultimately dependent upon amended independent claims 1 and 17, respectively.

Applicants' claimed method of claim 1 recites in part the following: "providing a surface bulletin comprising ritual engine manufacturer data and aviation authority data for incorporating at least one engineering change into a gas turbine engine". Applicants' claimed computer system recites in part the following: "means for displaying a service bulletin comprising original engine manufacturer data and aviation authority data for incorporating at least one engineering change into a gas turbine engine".

Baker generally teaches how to manage a project and the relevant portions cited by the Examiner explain how to breakdown a project into tasks, understanding the work breakdown structure, types of project management software and how to choose the right software for your projects (pages 89-102 and 361-375). Baker generally teaches how to manage a project but does not consider each and every aspect of every possible project that the teachings provided therein may be applied. Applicants' claims are a case in point. The Examiner erroneously asserts a service bulletin is simply a list of tasks, and such a list of tasks is equivalent to the work breakdown structure taught by Baker. Applicants contend the service bulletin is far more than a

list of tasks. The service bulletin comprises the original engine manufacturer data and aviation authority data for incorporating at least one engineering change into a gas turbine engine.

For at least these reasons, Applicants contend amended claims 1 and 17 are patentable and not anticipated by the teachings of Baker.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and find claims 1-6 and 17-22 are allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner asserts Claim 7 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Applicants Claims 7 and 23 are dependent upon amended Claims 1 and 17, respectively.

The Examiner asserts Baker discloses a project management method that can be applied to a variety of industries, regardless of the intended field of use of the method. The Examiner further states the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art.

Applicants contend the intended use of Applicants' claimed method and claimed computer system do in fact result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art, that is, Baker. Applicants' amended claim 1 recites in part the following: "providing a service bulletin comprising original engine manufacture data and aviation authority data for incorporating at least one engineering change into a gas- turbine engine". Applicants' amended claim 17 recites in part the following: "means for displaying a service bulletin comprising original engine manufacturer data and aviation authority data for incorporating at least one engineering change into a gas turbine engine". The "manipulative difference as compared to the prior art" is the incorporation of at least one engineering change by virtue of selecting a desired task, that is, the at least one engineering change, from the service bulletin and processing the desired task, that is, implementing the at least one engineering change to the gas turbine engine.

In processing the desired task, Applicants' claimed method and claimed computer system do manipulate the condition of the gas turbine engine. Baker generally teaches managing a project by organizing the tasks utilized to complete the project. However, Baker does not teach or suggest correlating the execution of tasks commensurate with changing the condition of a gas turbine engine according to at least one engineering change as disclosed in the service bulletin.

For at least these reasons, Applicants contend claims 7 and 23 are patentable and not obvious in view of the teachings of Baker.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and find claims 7 and 23 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims as pending patentably define over the art of record and an early indication of same is respectfully requested.

An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

It is submitted that the claims as amended herein patentably define over the art relied on by the Examiner and early allowance of same is courteously solicited.

If any fees are required in connection with this case, it is respectfully requested that they be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Budnik et al.

By /Ross J. Christie #47,492/

Ross J. Christie

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No.: 47,492

Telephone: 203-777-6628 x116

Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: March 6, 2007